UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 09/870,878 | 05/30/2001 | Vance M. Stephens | 10003568-1 | 8982 |

7590 12/27/2007

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

| EXAMINER | |
|---|---|
| LETT, THOMAS J | |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2625 | |

| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|---|---|
| 12/27/2007 | PAPER |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 09/870,878 | STEPHENS, VANCE M. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Thomas J. Lett | 2625 | |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *05 October 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-4,6-14 and 16-21* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-4,6-14 and 16-21* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *30 May 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

DOUGLAS Q. TRAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *10/05/07*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114*

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 05 October 2007 has been entered.

### *Response to Arguments*

2. Currently, claims 1-4, 6-14 and 16-21 are pending.

3. Applicant's after-final arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

4. Specifically, the applicant argues that the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of Ohsumi et al. (US 6,052,552) in view of Kato (US 6,799,761) does not meet the amended printing method feature of determining actual medium size and/or medium placement characteristics, said actual medium size characteristics including an actual medium length along the medium feed path.

5. Examiner views the Ohsumi in view of Kato combination to meet said feature and notes to the applicant that the claims in question are vague and lack sufficient descriptive language as to specify what the applicant argues is lacking in said prior art combination. For example the applicant might want to use terminology such as "calculating" and "measured" to replace the vague wording "determining" and "actual" in the claims.

As a basis for this suggestion, the examiner cites section 2111 [R-I] of the Manual for Patent Examining Procedure, Claim Interpretation; Broadest Reasonable Interpretation, CLAIMS MUST BE GIVEN THEIR BROADEST REASONABLE INTERPRETATION. During patent examination, the pending claims must be "given their broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification." In re Hyatt, 211 F.3d 1367, 1372, 54 USPQ2d 1664, 1667

(Fed. Cir. 2000). Applicant always has the opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution, and broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. In re Prater, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541,550-51 (CCPA 1969) (Claim 9 was directed to a process of analyzing data generated by mass spectrographic analysis of a gas. The process comprised selecting the data to be analyzed by subjecting the data to a mathematical manipulation. The examiner made rejections under 35 U.S.C. 101 and 102. In the 35 U.S.C. 102 rejection, the examiner explained that the claim was anticipated by a mental process augmented by pencil and paper markings. The court agreed that the claim was not limited to using a machine to carry out the process since the claim did not explicitly set forth the machine. The court explained that "reading a claim in light of the specification, to thereby interpret limitations explicitly recited in the claim, is a quite different thing from reading limitations of the specification into a claim,' to thereby narrow the scope of the claim by implicitly adding disclosed limitations which have no express basis in the claim." The court found that applicant was advocating the latter, i.e., the impermissible importation of subject matter from the specification into the claim.). See also In re Morris, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054-55, 44 USPQ2d 1023, 1027-28 (Fed. Cir. 1997) (The court held that the PTO is not required, in the course of prosecution, to interpret claims in applications in the same manner as a court would interpret claims in an infringement suit. Rather, the "PTO applies to verbiage of the proposed claims the broadest reasonable meaning of thewords in their ordinary usage as they would be understood by one of ordinary skill in the art, taking into account whatever enlightenment by way of definitions or otherwise that may be afforded by the written description contained in applicant's specification.").

Therefore, the examiners reasoning in the previous office action dated 08/04/2006, is maintained and viewed to cover the vague claim language.

6. Regarding claims 1 and dependent claims 2-4 and 6-10, which have all been amended to contain the contents of claim 5: The applicant argues the 35 U.S.C 103(a) rejection of Ohsumi et al. in view of Kato, by stating that "The examiner asserts that Kato discloses in column 5, lines 61-67 and column 6, lines 1-12 that 'information relating to the length of the sheet is detected'.", further the applicant argues that, "The cited passage of Kato does not describe that information relating to the length of the sheet is detected..."

The examiner notes that in the office action dated 02/10/2006 relating to the 35 U.S.C 103(a) rejection of Ohsumi et al. in view of Kato, examiner Rahimi correctly asserts that Kato discloses that information relating to the length of the sheet is detected in col. 5, lines 61-67 and col. 6, lines 1-12. Kato discloses, "The CPU determines the timing of the stop or the reversal of the large-diameter roller 25 according to the detection signal from the sheet detection means 27a or 27b and information relating to the length of the sheet in the conveying directions input from an operation unit (not shown)." The examiner interprets this to be equivalent to determining medium size pertaining to the actual medium length of the sheet along the media feed path (seen in Fig. 2 of Kato). The examiner further interprets the CPU to determine the actual length of the medium by means of the user input. For example if the user, supplying the user input to the CPU, determines the actual length to be 11 inches (along the direction of the media feed path) in a 8.5x11 inch piece of printing paper or medium, the CPU then determines the actual length from the user input. Further, as another example, the user is capable entering the actual length of paper, which may vary from the nominal size.

Therefore, the examiner interprets the reference to correctly read on the claimed features.

7. Regarding claim 7-8: The applicant argues the 35 U.S.C 103(a) rejection of Ohsumi et al. in view of Mizubata et al on the grounds that the Mizubata et al is not directed towards a

method for printing and is therefore not properly combinable with the teachings of Ohsumi as asserted by examiner Rahimi.

The examiner notes that examiner Rahimi correctly asserts the like field of endeavor as being Image-Forming apparatuses and Means to Correct for Skewness. This is viewed to be a proper like field of endeavor for the obviousness combination.

8. Regarding claim 11 and its respective dependent claims 12-14 and 16-21, which have all been amended to contain the contents of claim 15: The applicant argues that the Ohsumi et al. in view of Wibbels et al combination and examiner Rahimi's obviousness claim, by stating that, "the examiner has made only broad, conclusory statements regarding the teachings of the references, and has asserted a broad statement of an alleged motivation to combine, i.e. to 'reproduce the original in the same exact layout.' Yet there is no description as to how the references provide this alleged suggestion, or indeed how the alleged suggestion would lead one to the claimed subject matter".

The examiner views Wibbles et al to sufficiently disclose the method of alignment, as claimed, in column 5, lines 1-15, and further views both examiner Rahimi's obviousness statement and motivational statement for combination to be sufficient. Also, the examiner notes that the newly amended content of claim 15 with claim 11 warrants the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of Ohsumi et al. in view of Wibbels et al in further view of Kato. Also, for similar reasons as stated above in claim 1 combined with claim 5, the newly amended content from claim 15 is viewed by the examiner to be sufficiently met by the Kato combination.

Arguments posed for claims 17-18 are similar to those disclosed above for claims 7- 8. Therefore, the examiner's responses for claims 7-8, also hold for claims 17-18.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1-4, 6 and 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohsumi et al. (Ohsumi, US 6,052,552) in view of Kato (US 6,799,761).

With respect to claim 1, Ohsumi discloses a method for printing an image on a print medium comprising: positioning the print medium at a print zone (col 3, lines 21- 25); determining actual medium size and/or medium placement characteristics (col 3, lines 32-35); using size and/or placement characteristics, shifting an image to be printed relative nominal size and/or placement characteristics (col 5, lines 1-15); and printing the shifted image on the medium (col 5, lines 1-15).Ohsumi does not disclose wherein, said actual medium size characteristics including an actual medium length along a media feed path.

Kato discloses in column 5, lines 61-67 and column 6, lines 1-12 that information relating to the length of the sheet is detected.

Ohsumi and Kato are analogous art, because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely Image Forming Apparatuses with Mechanisms for Detecting the Position of a Recording Medium.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to include length characteristics of the medium.

The suggestion or motivation for doing so would have been to control the roller advance in the printer for proper placement of the image.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Ohsumi and Kate to obtain the invention specified in claim 1.

With respect to claim 2, Ohsumi in view of Kato disclose the method of claim 1, wherein the image extends from lateral edge to lateral edge of the medium (col 4, lines 59-67).

Ohsumi discloses that margins are determined by timing of image forming by the laser on the photoconductor. Such timing can be conceivably adjusted to leave margin of zero or no margin (col 4, lines 59-67).

With respect to claim 3, Ohsumi in view of Kato disclose the method of claim 1, wherein said actual medium size and/or placement characteristics include an absolute location of a point on a leading edge of the medium (col 3, lines 32-35).13.

With respect to claim 4, Ohsumi in view of Kato disclose the method of claim 1, wherein said actual medium size and/or placement characteristics include a skew characteristic a leading edge of the medium (abstract).

With respect to claim 6, Ohsumi in view of Kato disclose the method of claim 1, wherein said actual medium size and/or placement characteristics include a medium width characteristic (col 4, lines 37-44).

With respect to claim 9, Ohsumi in view of Kato disclose the method of claim 1, wherein said image includes shifting the position of the print medium along a media feed path (col 4, lines 10-18).

With respect to claim 10, Ohsumi in view of Kato disclose the method of claim 1, wherein an area of the image smaller than an area medium, so that margins are provided on the medium after said printing (see claim 2 argument).

10. Claims 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohsumi et al. (Ohsumi, US 6,052,552) in view of Kato (US 6,799,761) in further view of Mizubata et al (Mizubata, US 6,888,650).

With respect to claim 7, Ohsumi in view of Kato disclose the method of claim 1. Ohsumi in view of Kato do not disclose, wherein said shifting said image includes digitally shifting the image in a direction aligned with or transverse to a medium advance axis. Mizubata discloses this limitation in column 7, lines 36-42.

Ohsumi, Kato, and Mizubata are analogous art, because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely Image Forming Devices.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to combine Ohsumi in view of Kato's method of claim 1, with Mizubata's method of shifting an image, including digitally shifting the image in a direction aligned with or transverse to a medium advance axis.

The suggestion or motivation for doing so would have been to correct for misalignment of the image.

With respect to claim 8, Ohsumi in view of Kato in further view of Mizubata disclose the method of claim 1, wherein said shifting said image includes digitally rotating the image (col 7, lines 36-42).

11. Claims 11-14, 16, 19 and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohsumi et al. (Ohsumi, US 6,052,552) in view of Kato (US 6,799,761) in further view Wibbels et al. (Wibbels, US 6,118,950).

With respect to claim 11, Ohsumi in view of Kato disclose a method for duplex printing an image on a print medium, comprising: positioning a front side of the print medium at a print zone (col 3, lines 33-35);

determining actual size and/or placement characteristic of the medium (col 3, lines 33-35); said actual medium size characteristics including an actual medium length along a media feed path (Kato: col 5, lines 61-67 and col 6, lines 1-12);

printing a front side image on said front side (col 3, lines 66-67 and col 4, lines 1-10);

measuring leading edge and absolute location characteristics of the flipped print medium (col 3, lines 33-35, after paper is turned over similar position detection is employed);Although Ohsumi discloses in column 5, lines 1-15, the importance of aligning front and back images, he does not explain the method of alignment that is by calculating shift parameters to shift the back side image to align with the front side image placement and print a shifted back side image.

Wibbels discloses these limitations in column 5, lines 12-30 by shifting the front and back images for alignment of images.

Ohsumi, Kato and Wibbels are analogous art, because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely Image Forming Apparatuses.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to combine Ohsumi in view of Kato's method for duplex printing, with Wibbels's method of alignment which calculates shift parameters to shift the back side image to align with the front side image placement and print a shifted back side image.

The suggestion or motivation for doing so would have been to avoid subsequent cutting of copy sheet causing cutting away the images (Ohsumi- col 5, lines 9-15). 22. With respect to claims 12-14, the features disclosed are analogous to those presented for claim 2-4. Therefore the examiner's explanations given above for claims 2-4 also hold for claims 12-14.

With respect to claims 16, 19 and 20, the features disclosed are analogous to those presented for claim 6, 9 and 10. Therefore the examiner's explanations given above for claims 6, 9 and 10 also hold for claims 16, 19 and 20.

With respect to claim 21 Ohsumi et al. in view of Kato in further view Wibbels et al. disclose the method of claim 11, wherein said determining actual size and placement characteristics of the medium is performed without printing on said print medium (Kato: col 5, lines 61-67 and col 6, lines 1-12).

The examiner interprets the determination of the medium size to pertain to the actual medium length of the sheet along the media feed path (seen in Fig 2 of Kato and disclosed in parent claim 11). The examiner notes this size is determined by input from the operation unit, which does not include printing on the print medium. Also, the placement characteristics are likewise derived from means other than printing on the print medium (Kato: col 5, lines 61-67 and col 6, lines 1-12).

12. Claims 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohsumi et al. (US 6,052,552) in view of Kato (US 6,799,761) in further view of Wibbels et al (US 6,118,950) in further view of Mizubata et al (US 6,888,650).

With respect to claim 17, Ohsumi in view of Kato in further view of Wibbels disclose the method of claim 11.

Ohsumi in view of Kato in further view of Wibbels do not disclose wherein the shifting of the image includes digitally shifting the image in a direction aligned with or transverse to a medium advance axis.

Mizubata discloses this limitation in column 7, lines 36-42.

Ohsumi, Kato, Wibbels and Mazubata are analogous art, because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely Image Forming Apparatuses.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to combine Ohsumi in view of Kato in further view of Wibbels's method of claim 11, wit Mizubata's

method of shifting of an image including digitally shifting the image in a direction aligned with or transverse to a medium advance axis.

The suggestion or motivation for doing so would have been to correct for the misalignment of the image.

With respect to claim 18, Ohsumi in view of Kato in further view of Wibbels in yet further view of Mazubata, disclose the method of claim 11, wherein said shifting said image includes digitally rotating the image (col 7, lines 36-42).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

13. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable over Storlie et al (USPN 5,093,674).

Regarding claim 1, Storlie et al disclose a method for printing an image on a print medium, comprising:

positioning (positioned near a drum 30, col. 4, lines 65-68) the print medium (paper 34, col. 4, lines 65-68) at a print zone;

determining actual medium size and medium placement characteristics, said actual medium size characteristics including an actual medium length along a media feed path (size, position and alignment are determined by paper position sensor 44, col. 5, lines 15-20 and optical sensors 50 and 52, col. 29-39);

using the size and placement characteristics, shifting an image to be printed relative to nominal size and medium placement characteristics (shifting is performed by correction stage 62, col. 6, lines 34-39); and

printing the shifted image on the medium (printed on print media 34, see at least col. 6, line 38-39).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

14. Claims 2-4, 6 and 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Storlie et al (USPN 5,093,674) in view of Ohsumi et al (US 6,052,552).

Regarding claim 2, Storlie et al do not expressly disclose a method of claim 1 wherein the image extends from lateral edge to lateral edge of the medium.

Ohsumi discloses the image extends from lateral edge to lateral edge of the medium (col 4, lines 59-67). Ohsumi discloses that margins are determined by timing of image forming by the laser on the photoconductor. Such timing can be conceivably adjusted to leave margin of zero or no margin (col 4, lines 59-67).

Storlie et al and Ohsumi are analogous art because they are from the similar problem solving area of image forming apparatuses. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add the feature of Ohsumi to Storlie et al in

order to obtain an image extending from edge to edge. The motivation for doing so would be to print an image on the entire surface area.

With respect to claim 3, Regarding claim 2, Storlie et al do not expressly disclose that said actual medium size and/or placement characteristics include an absolute location of a point on a leading edge of the medium.

Ohsumi teaches that said actual medium size and/or placement characteristics include an absolute location of a point on a leading edge of the medium (col 3, lines 32-35).

Storlie et al and Ohsumi are analogous art because they are from the similar problem solving area of image forming apparatuses. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add the feature of Ohsumi to Storlie et al in order to obtain an absolute location point. The motivation for doing so would be to reference a point.

Regarding claim 4, Storlie et al do not expressly disclose that said actual medium size and/or placement characteristics include a skew characteristic a leading edge of the medium

Ohsumi discloses that said actual medium size and/or placement characteristics include a skew characteristic a leading edge of the medium (see abstract).

Storlie et al and Ohsumi are analogous art because they are from the similar problem solving area of image forming apparatuses. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add the feature of Ohsumi to Storlie et al in order to obtain a size/placement. The motivation for doing so would be to reference a characteristic.

Regarding claim 6, Storlie et al do not expressly disclose that said actual medium size and/or placement characteristics include a medium width characteristic.

Ohsumi teaches that said actual medium size and/or placement characteristics include a medium width characteristic (col. 4, lines 37-44).

Storlie et al and Ohsumi are analogous art because they are from the similar problem solving area of image forming apparatuses. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add the feature of Ohsumi to Storlie et al in order to obtain an size/placement. The motivation for doing so would be to reference a characteristic.

Regarding claim 9, Storlie et al do not expressly disclose that said image includes shifting the position of the print medium along a media feed path.

Ohsumi teaches that said image includes shifting the position of the print medium along a media feed path (col. 4, lines 10-18).

Storlie et al and Ohsumi are analogous art because they are from the similar problem solving area of image forming apparatuses. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add the feature of Ohsumi to Storlie et al in order to obtain a placement shift. The motivation for doing so would be to reference an image characteristic.

Regarding claim 10, Storlie et al do not expressly disclose that an area of the image smaller than an area medium, so that margins are provided on the medium after said printing.

Ohsumi discloses the image extends from lateral edge to lateral edge of the medium (col 4, lines 59-67). Ohsumi discloses that margins are determined by timing of image forming by the laser on the photoconductor. Such timing can be conceivably adjusted to leave margin of zero or no margin (col 4, lines 59-67).

Storlie et al and Ohsumi are analogous art because they are from the similar problem solving area of image forming apparatuses. At the time of the invention, it would have been

obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add the feature of Ohsumi to Storlie et al in order to obtain an image extending from edge to edge. The motivation for doing so would be to print an image on the entire surface area.

15. Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Storlie et al (US 5,093,674) in view of Ohsumi et al (US 6,052,552) in further view of Mizubata et al (US 6,888,650).

With respect to claim 7, Storlie in view of Ohsumi disclose the method of claim 1. Storlie/Ohsumi do not disclose, wherein said shifting said image includes digitally shifting the image in a direction aligned with or transverse to a medium advance axis.

Mizubata discloses this limitation in column 7, lines 36-42.

Storlie, Ohsumi, and Mizubata are analogous art, because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely Image Forming Devices.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to combine Storlie/Ohsumi's method of claim 1, with Mizubata's method of shifting an image, including digitally shifting the image in a direction aligned with or transverse to a medium advance axis.

The suggestion or motivation for doing so would have been to correct for misalignment of the image.

With respect to claim 8, Storlie in view of Ohsumi in further view of Mizubata disclose the method of claim 1, wherein said shifting said image includes digitally rotating the image (col. 7, lines 36-42).

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas J. Lett whose telephone number is (571) 272-7464. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David K. Moore can be reached on (571) 272-7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/TL/
AU 2625

DOUGLAS Q. TRAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER